

of Washington Amendment, “aye” rollcall No. 238: Polis/Andrews Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 239: Polis Amendment, “no”; rollcall No. 240: Van Hollen of Maryland Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 241: Blumenauer of Oregon Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 242: DeLauro of Connecticut Amendment, “aye”; rollcall No. 243: Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 1960, “aye”; rollcall No. 244: H.R. 1960—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, “aye”.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 2013

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Instead of focusing on much needed job creation legislation . . . or addressing the student loan interest rates set to double in a matter of days . . . the House Republican Leadership has decided to bring up a bill that is unconstitutional and unconscionable.

This legislation would ban abortions after 20 weeks nationwide . . . with no exceptions to protect a woman's health and with the most narrow exceptions for rape or incest.

I have always believed that such a deeply personal issue can only be made by the woman herself . . . in consultation with her doctor . . . and her most trusted loved ones.

This legislation is an attempt to insert the federal government into this decision making process and chip away at a woman's right to choose.

For the young women in Sacramento and nationwide, I oppose this legislation in order to protect their health and their rights . . . and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

COMMEMORATING WORLD REFUGEE DAY

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2013

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate World Refugee Day and recognize the more than 43 million forcibly displaced people around the world, a number of whom—in search of a better life in America—have resettled in Michigan's Macomb and Oakland counties, which I proudly represent.

World Refugee Day is observed June 20 of each year and is dedicated to raising awareness of the plight of the millions of refugees and internally displaced persons who have been forced to flee their homes due to conflict, persecution, and strife. This day serves as a special reminder of the courage of these resilient individuals and provides us the opportunity to draw attention to their struggle.

The United States is by far the largest donor to the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR), and this commitment from the American people has helped deliver critical humanitarian aid to the world's most vulnerable populations. U.S.-sup-

ported work of the UNHCR includes providing safe food, clean drinking water, shelter, education, security in dangerous situations, and ultimately durable placement options—voluntary repatriation, local integration, or resettlement.

Today is also a time to recognize the positive contributions of refugees who have created new lives in this country. Due to America's historic commitment to welcoming and resettling victims of persecution from around the world, communities all over the country have benefited from refugees' enthusiasm, entrepreneurial spirit, and sense of civic engagement.

Over the last ten years, thousands of Iraqi refugees have resettled in my district—a development that has had a positive impact on the region. I value their contributions and am proud to support the work of local resettlement organizations to integrate new arrivals into American society. This past April, I had the opportunity to visit with the Chaldean American Ladies of Charity at their food bank and home goods warehouse. There I met a young Iraqi mother and her son, both of whom had recently arrived in the United States and resettled in Metro Detroit. The efforts of the established Chaldean community to assist recent refugees were truly impressive, and I was struck by how grateful the mother was for the opportunity to start a new life for her family in the United States.

Today, as we mark World Refugee Day, I urge my colleagues to renew their commitment to providing humanitarian aid and resettlement assistance to victims of ethnic, religious and political persecution as well as other vulnerable people who have been forced to flee their homes due to natural or man-made disasters.

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FY2014

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2013

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in reluctant opposition to H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

The NDAA offers Congress an opportunity to provide the resources we need for our Armed Forces and a chance to address some of the significant challenges that must be confronted—like the mechanisms for confronting cases of sexual abuse in the military. While I appreciate the House Armed Services Committee's continued support of our servicemembers and our national defense, this bill contains a number of serious flaws. These include providing over \$5 billion in OCO funding that the Pentagon did not request, imposing funding restrictions that would prohibit the construction or modification of a detention facility in the United States to house Guantanamo detainees, and establishing an unnecessary missile defense site on the East Coast.

I was particularly disappointed that a bipartisan amendment I introduced—which would have ensured that the FY2014 funding for the war in Afghanistan and other overseas contingencies is at the level the DoD and military leaders say is necessary for the mis-

sion—was not adopted. The funding level in the National Defense Authorization bill for Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) for Fiscal Year 2014 is set at \$85.8—\$5 billion more than the \$80.7 billion the Defense Department says is necessary to achieve the mission. Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Martin Dempsey both testified before the House Budget Committee that the FY2014 OCO level of \$80.7 billion requested in the President's budget was sufficient to meet our military's needs. At a time of fiscal constraint, we simply cannot afford to provide more funding than our military leaders say is needed.

Part of the reason some may have hesitated to support the amendment was due to claims that it would have eliminated funding for National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment modernization. But, that was simply not true.

As we continue to search for a way to turn off the sequester by replacing it with a more rational deficit reduction package, we shouldn't allow the OCO designation to be used as a loophole to get around spending caps that are written in law as the defense authorization bill did. That is not a solution to the sequester. Instead, we should find a balanced deficit reduction plan to replace sequestration so that we can provide adequate funding to maintain a military that is second to none and make the investments in education, scientific research, and infrastructure necessary to keep our economy strong, which is the foundation of our security. Unfortunately, the House Republican budget takes the opposite approach. It cuts even more deeply into vital investments in our kids' education and in the investments in innovation and technology that help grow our economy. It cuts the part of the budget that funds education and vital medical research by 19 percent below the sequester. And despite claims to want to strengthen our embassy security in the aftermath of tragedies like Behnghazi, it slashes State Department operations by over 15 percent.

Despite my opposition to the overall legislation, I was pleased to see that this bill incorporated initiatives that begin to address the problem of sexual assault in the military. Unfortunately, the measures adopted were inadequate to meet the challenge. I was especially disappointed that Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER was denied the opportunity to offer an important amendment to strengthen accountability and improve the process.

I also share many of the other concerns that were outlined in the President's Statement of Administration Policy. This includes a misguided provision in the bill which would continue funding restrictions that prohibit the construction or modification of a detention facility in the United States to house Guantanamo detainees, and would constrain DoD's ability to transfer Guantanamo detainees, including those who have already been designated for transfer to other countries. In addition, I strongly object to a requirement in this bill which would limit the President's ability to implement the New START Treaty and to set the country's nuclear policy.

I am also opposed to sections 232 and 233 in this bill, which authorize the establishment of a missile defense site on the East Coast that the Pentagon says is unnecessary. These provisions disregard the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and seek to tie the President's